

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATION FROM  
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)**

**International File Reference**  
**IAP20 Rec'd 6 NOV 2005 DEP 28 DEC 2005**  
**PCT/EP2004/050979**

Re item V.

**1. Reference is made to the following documents:**

- D1: US 5 029 071 A (KINOSHITA ET AL) 2 July 1991 (1991-06-02)  
D2: EP 0 461 792 A (ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC) 18 December 1991 (1991-12-18)  
D3: US 5 551 047 A (MORI ET AL) 27 August 1996 (1996-08-27)

**2. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1), because the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel within the meaning of PCT Article 33(2).

Document D1 discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document): A method for monitoring the execution of a program in a microcomputer of an electronic device (a data processing system with a microprocessor 11 and a memory 13, column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 1, and figure 1). According to the inventive method, the program processes input data and produces output data (abstract), and in addition to the execution of the program a copy of the program, which is stored in a different address area than the program (memory 14 stores programs of the same contents as memory 13, column 2, line 8 – line 10), is executed using the input data provided for the program (microprocessor 11 processes input data supplied from the I/O device, column 2, line 51 – line 53). The output data of the copy are compared to the data of the program (a comparator compares output data from the microprocessor 11 with output data from microprocessor 12, column 2, line 24 - line 28) and an error message is produced if the data are not consistent (output of a noncoincidence signal, column 2, line 28 – line 33).

The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore not novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

3. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 4

- 3.1 The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1), because the subject matter of claim 4 is not based on an inventive step within the meaning of PCT Article 33(3).

Document D2 discloses (the references in brackets relate to this document): A method for monitoring the execution of a program in two interconnected processors (a pair of processors are connected in a master/slave configuration, abstract, the master and the slave executing the same program instructions, column 2, line 41 – line 44, line 47 – line 49). One of the processors produces a request which is transmitted to the other processor and there uses prescribed input data to prompt the execution of a program (the slave receives inputs of the master and mimics operation of the master on said inputs, claim 1). The output data from the two processors are then compared with one another (the mimicked outputs are compared with the master outputs, claim 1).

- 3.2 The subject matter of claim 4 therefore differs from the method from D2 in that the two processors belong to two microcomputers, in that the output data from the program execution performed by the second microcomputer are returned to the first microcomputer, and in that the comparison between the output data from the two program executions is performed in the first microcomputer. In the method in D2, the output data from the program execution performed by the first processor are, in contrast, sent to the second processor and compared there.
- 3.3 The feature of returning the output data to the first processor is just one of several obvious options from which the person skilled in the art would select, according to circumstances, without any inventive action in order to achieve the object in question. Document D3, particularly column 3, line 58 – line 65, describes, by way of example, a plurality of processors which each contain means for sending and receiving output data from the other processors for comparison of their program executions.

3.4 Consequently, the subject matter of claim 4 is not based on an inventive step (PCT Article 33(3)).

**4. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3, 5 – 7**

Against the background of documents D1 to D3, claims 3, 5 – 7 contain no features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, meet the requirements of the PCT in relation to inventive step.

**5. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2, 8 – 9**

The combination of features contained in the dependent claims is neither known from the present prior art nor rendered obvious by it.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
SEPARATE SHEET

IAP20 REC'D PCT/EP 20 DEC 2005

## Box No. I. Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
 a sequence listing  
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
 in written format  
 in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
 contained in the international application as filed.  
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

10/62741

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
SEPARATE SHEET

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/050979

IAP20 Rec'd PCT PTO 20 DEC 2005

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes	Claims	2-9
	No	Claims	1
Inventive Step (IS)	Yes	Claims	2,8-9
	No	Claims	1,3-7
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Yes	Claims	1-9
	No	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations:

see separate sheet